shrines brought to light in the course of my explorations, and the relative ease with which the sacred sites mentioned by Hsüan-tsang can still be traced, illustrate in the same way the truth of all he has to say about Buddhist worship in Khotan.

Of the reigning king Hsüan-tsang tells us that he was extremely courageous and warlike, Kings of and greatly venerated the law of Buddha. Referring to the king's claim to be descended from 632-648A.D. the god Vaiśravaṇa, the pilgrim then proceeds to relate the legend of the first settlement of Khotan and of Kustana's birth, which we have already analysed in detail. Neither Hsüan-tsang nor the Annals give us the name of the king ruling in 644. It thus remains doubtful whether he was identical with one or other of the chiefs whose names are recorded for the years 632 and 648. At the earlier date the T'ang Annals mention an embassy from Wei-ch'ih Wu-mi, bringing presents to the imperial court, and note that this king was originally subject to the T'u-chüeh (Western Turks) 17. In 635, or, according to the Chiu T'ang shu, in 639 A. D., the same ruler sent his son, who was enrolled in the imperial guard 18. After the subjugation of Kuchā in 648 A.D., Fu-tu Hsin, the prince reigning at Khotan, felt intimidated, and sent his son with three hundred camels as an offering. The subsequent arrival at Khotan of a Chinese officer, Hsieh Wan-pei, with some light cavalry, sufficed to induce the king to proceed himself to the imperial court to present his submission. The emperor Kao tsung, who had in the meantime ascended the throne (649 A.D.), bestowed honorary appointments in the imperial guards upon him and his son Shih-hu (Jabgu) Tien, and dismissed him with rich presents 19. Embassies from Khotan are also mentioned for the years 636, 642, 644, 645 A.D., but without the name of the king who sent them 20.

In 648 or 649 A. D. Khotan was officially placed under the protectorate of An-hsi, then estab- Khotan lished at Kuchā, and thus became one of the 'Four Garrisons' (including also Kuchā, Kāshgar, included in the 'Four and Tokmak), which were to be controlled from that centre 21. We have seen already with Garrisons', reference to Kāshgar that the Chinese administrative organization extending over the whole of 648/9 A.D. the Tārīm Basin did not interfere with the rule of individual territories by local dynasties. This observation is borne out also by whatever historical notices we gather about Khotan during the period while this Chinese protectorate lasted.

The latter may be said to have been finally established in 659 A. D., when the last remnants of the supremacy of the Western Turks were swept away by the imperial armies 22. In the same year a Chinese force vanquished the Turkish chief Tu-man, who, at the head of the states of Kāshgar, Chu-chü-po (Karghalik), and Ho-p'an-t'o (Sarīkol), had revolted and attacked the kingdom of Yü-t'ien 23. Some years later another rebellion, in which the tribe of the Kung-yueh and the ruler of Kāshgar appear to have been principally concerned, received support from the Tibetans. The latter then seem to have made their first attempts in the direction of Eastern Turkestān, and it is interesting to note that it was the king of Khotan who had to be succoured by Chinese troops from their attack in the year 66524. The mention made on this occasion of

<sup>17</sup> See Turcs occid., p. 126. According to the Ts'é fu yüan kuei (Chavannes, Notes add. sur les Tou-kiue, p. 4; Ville de Khotan, p. 67), the gift consisted of a jade girdle.

<sup>18</sup> Turcs occid., p. 126, note 2.

<sup>19</sup> Chavannes, Turcs occid., pp. 126, 178; Notes addit., р. 18.

Embassies in the first three years are quoted by the Pien i tien (Ville de Khotan, pp. 67 sq.) from the Ts'é fu yüan kuei, but M. Chavannes' extracts from this encyclopaedia

show a mission only for the year 645; comp. Notes addit., p. 13.

<sup>21</sup> See Turcs occid., pp. 118, 268; Notes addit., p. 19; also above, p. 60.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Compare Chavannes, Turcs occid., p. 268; above, p. 60.

<sup>28</sup> See Turcs occid., p. 72.

<sup>24</sup> Turcs occid., p. 122, note.